



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/632,995	08/04/2000	Sang-Uuk Song	5000-1-122	2594

7590 05/05/2004

STEVE S. CHA
CHA & REITER
411 HACKENSACK AVE, 9TH FLOOR
HACKENSACK, NJ 07601

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TU X

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2684

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/632,995

Applicant(s)

SONG, SANG-UUK

Examiner

Tu X Nguyen

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 7-17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3/9/04, claim 1 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges et al. (US Patent 6,148,197) in view of Chow et al. (US Patent 6,456,839).

Regarding claim 1, Bridges et al. disclose "receiving, by the portable radio telephone (fig.2B,C), a home-zone list downloaded from a home location register" (see col.7 lines 30-62);

Determining, by the portable radio telephone, whether the portable radio telephone deviates from the home zone (see col.12 lines 20-50) to make a determination of either deviation or non-deviation from the home zone; and

Responsive (see col.6 lines 4-45) to the determination of deviation, informing, by the portable radio telephone, to a mobile switching center of said determination of deviation (see col.12 lines 20-50, col.17 lines 37-65).

Bridges et al. fail to disclose a "first charging rate" and "second charging rate".

Chow et al. disclose a "first charging rate" and "second charging rate" see (col.6 lines 34-38). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Bridges with the above teaching of Chow in order to provide neighborhood cordless services at a single rate such that there is no air time change for calls made within a home neighborhood zone or subscribed-to visiting neighborhood zone(s) (as suggested by Chow et al., see col.1 lines 10-15).

Regarding claim 2, the modified Bridges discloses the first charging rate corresponds to a wired telephone call rate and the second charging rate corresponds to a radio telephone call rate (see Chow, col.5 lines 15-20 and col.6 lines 33-35).

4. Claims 3-6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges et al., in view of Chow et al. and further in view of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,642,398).

As to claim 3, the modified Bridges et al. disclose everything as claim 1 above. More specifically, the modified Bridges et al. disclose "checking whether a location registration request is received from a portable radio telephone; and if the location registration request is received, checking whether the portable radio telephone deviates from the home zone by checking whether the current position of the portable radio telephone is included in a home-zone list" (see Chow, coll.8 lines 39-65);

upon receiving a call origination from the portable radio telephone, releasing the call origination if the portable radio telephone is deviated from the home zone (see Chow, col.7 lines 20-22);

disregarding a call termination if the portable radio telephone deviated from the home zone receives the call termination (see col.7 lines 24-25); and,

the modified Bridges et al. fail to disclose preventing a paging by the MSC to notify the portable radio telephone that the portable telephone deviated from the home zone.

Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose preventing a paging by the MSC to notify the portable radio telephone that the portable telephone deviated from the home zone (see col.13 lines 60-63). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Bridges with the above teaching of Tiedemann, Jr. in order to prevent a mobile station that failed to execute a power down registration from being uselessly paged.

As to claim 4, the modified Bridges disclose informing the portable radio telephone when the call origination or the call termination is released (see Chow, col.8 lines 1-19 and lines 60-65).

As to claim 5, the modified Bridges et al. disclose downloading the home-zone list in a memory means of the portable radio telephone (see Bridges, col.7 lines 30-62);

As to claim 6, the modified Bridges et al. disclose a "first charging rate" and "second charging rate" (see Chow, col.6 lines 34-38).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 7-17 allowed.

6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding independent claim 7, none of prior art teaching "a location registration message generating section coupled to the comparing section for generating a location registration message to attempt a location registration to the mobile switching center when the BTS information is not included in the home-zone list" as cited in the claim.

Regarding independent claim 12, none of prior art teaching "a comparing section for checking whether the portable radio telephone deviated from the home zone by comparing the home-zone list to a sector of a currently tuned base transceiver station from the signal received by the receiving section" as cited in the claim.

Regarding independent claim 15, none of prior art teaching "a location registration message generating section for confirming that the portable radio telephone deviates from the home zone if the pseudo noise code identical to the detected pseudo nose code does not exist in the home-zone list" as cited in the claim.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tu Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3427. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MAUNG NAY A, can be reached at (703) 308-7749.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office at (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

April 20, 2004


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER